

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 22 are amended.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nguyen at the interview held April 26, 2004, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

**I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

**A. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4 and 6-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Kudo (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,435). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Kudo fails to disclose or teach all the features recited in claims 1-4 and 6-21.

Specifically, Kudo fails to disclose or teach the feature that a plurality of frame selection circuit which are provided in correspondence with the plurality of grayscale pattern selection circuits because Kudo discloses that the frame selection circuits 21 comprises the grayscale pattern selection circuits and thus can not be in correspondence with the plurality of grayscales pattern selection circuits, as recited in claims 1 and 20, and similarly recited in claim 6.

As discussed during the April 26 personal interview, merely discovering the word "correspondence" in Kudo does not mean that Kudo meets all the limitations of claims 1 and 6. Specifically, the word "correspondence" in Kudo does not modify the relationship between the grayscale pattern selection circuits and the frame selection circuits.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Kudo fails to disclose or teach the feature that the random access memory is electrically connected to the grayscale pattern selection circuit, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 6.

Instead, Kudo discloses that the frame rate memory (Fig. 2, 8A and 8B) is electrically connected to the data selector/data width converters (Figs. 2, 25 and 26). Thus, the random access memory is not electrically connected to the frame rate control operator 21, which the Office Action asserts is the grayscale pattern selection circuit.

In addition, regarding claim 20, it is respectfully submitted that Kudo fails to disclose or teach the feature of selecting one grayscale pattern from a plurality of grayscale patterns having at least two types of frame cycles. Instead, Kudo merely discloses selecting a plurality of grayscale patterns in one frame cycle, which is in contrast to claim 20.

Regarding claim 26, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is allowable at least for the reasons stated in the April 20 Amendment. It is respectfully submitted that since claims 2-5, 7-19 and 21 depend from claims 1, 6 and 20 respectively, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons stated regarding claims 1, 6 and 20. Withdraw of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-21 is respectfully requested.

**B. Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kudo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that as to claim 5, Kudo "teach a plurality grayscale number 1 to number 64 pattern generator correspond to a plurality of selectors (108) (Fig. 4, col. 10, lines 12-50)." The Office Action further asserts that "it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make separable selector (108), since such a modification would have involved a mere chance in the making separable of a component because the selector (108) still select the grayscale patterns for liquid crystal display device (9). A making separable is

generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In addition, make separable of a well known element is normally not directed toward patentable subject matter."

It is respectfully submitted that Kudo fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 5. Specifically, since claim 5 depends from claim 1, claim 5 is allowable at least for the reasons stated above regarding claim 1.

Withdraw of the rejection of claim 5 is respectfully requested.

## II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-26 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

David E. Brown  
Registration No. 51,091

JAO:DEB/tbh

Date: May 20, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--